

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-24 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12 and 20 being the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 12 and 20 and dependent claims 2, 14 and 21 are sought to be amended. Claim 13 was previously canceled and claim 15 is sought to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-5, 12, 14, 15 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117831 (hereinafter referred to as “Ellis”). Claims 6-11 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over WO 00/40028 (hereinafter referred to as “Lang”) and Ellis. Regarding claims 7 and 9, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to store and stream television programs in compressed form, and to decompress said programs prior to viewing, for the purpose of minimizing required storage space and transmission

**Appln. Serial No. 09/823,400**  
**Reply to final Office Action mailed on July 13, 2005**

bandwidth. Regarding claims 10, 11, 18 and 19, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to replace or update EPG software in a set-top box for the purpose of upgrading older software to a newer, improved version. Regarding claims 6, 8, 16 and 17, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to encrypt both streaming and stored media content in order to limit access to said content to authorized viewers, and likewise it is well known in the art for content receivers such as set-top boxes to include decryption means to decrypt encrypted media content when appropriate, for the purpose of permitting authorized users to enjoy encrypted content. Claim 15 has been canceled rendering the rejection to this claim moot. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 1-12, 14 and 16-24 since Ellis and Lang, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 12 and 20 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 12 and 20 have been amended to include a similar feature of invoking a first content manager when either a first streamed content is selected or a first stored content is selected via the program guide, wherein the first streamed content and the first stored content are a first digital data type; and invoking a second content manager when a user selects either a second streamed content or a second stored content via the program guide, wherein the second streamed content and the second stored content are a second digital data type and wherein the first digital data type and the second digital data type are different. Accordingly, the present claimed invention invokes one content manager to support selected content that is of one digital data type and a different content manager to support selected content that is of a different digital data type. Ellis and Lang, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason,

**Appln. Serial No. 09/823,400**  
**Reply to final Office Action mailed on July 13, 2005**

independent claims 1, 12 and 20 (and their dependent claims 2-11, 14, 16-19 and 21-24) are patentable over Ellis and Lang, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Appln. Serial No. 09/823,400  
Reply to final Office Action mailed on July 13, 2005

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: August 31, 2005

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126  
Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-3311

P10860 Reply to Final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

August 31, 2005  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Deposit

Katherine Jennings  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Katherine Jennings  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

August 31, 2005  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date